UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/541,823	07/11/2005	Danuta Ciok	P70681US0	6121

69289 7590 05/03/2010

COLOPLAST A/S
Attention: Corporate Patents
Holtedam 1
DK-3050 Humleback,
DENMARK

EXAMINER	
HAND, MELANIE JO	

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
3761	

NOTIFICATION DATE	DELIVERY MODE
05/03/2010	ELECTRONIC

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

patent@coloplast.com
dkbvd@coloplast.com

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/541,823	CIOK ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	MELANIE J. HAND	3761	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE *3* MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *28 January 2010*.

2a)☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☐ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *37,39-47,50,51,53-55 and 60* is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☒ Claim(s) *60* is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *37,39-47,50 and 51* is/are rejected.

7)☒ Claim(s) *53-55* is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☒ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☒ The drawing(s) filed on *11 July 2005* is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☒ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☒ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

1.☒ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Arguments

1. Applicant's arguments filed January 28, 2010 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. With respect to arguments regarding claim 37, the fact that Nielsen discloses rolling of the inner rim/ring which after release will unroll and seal only serves to clearly illustrate the examiner's position that the adhesion of the first surface to the second surface is temporary, but that even that temporary adhesion yielding the rolled configuration in Fig. 7 necessarily clearly exhibits a compatibility between the moldable backing second surface with adhesive sprayed thereon and its first surface. That, together with Nielsen's suggestion of a hydrophobic adhesive on the second surface, yields a modified version of the Nielsen device, again, fairly suggested by Nielsen's very disclosure, in which the first and second surfaces both contain adhesives, wherein the second surface hydrophobic adhesive is compatible. When the inner rim is everted, there is no other possibility for maintaining this rolled configuration shown in Fig. 7 without the action of the adhesives on the first and second surfaces, wherein said action is a direct result of the compatibility of the second surface adhesive with the first surface. As to the argument that Nielsen does not disclose or suggest the limitation that the stoma-accommodating hole is to be enlarged by removing the removable release liner from the second surface from the second surface to expose the hydrophobic adhesive layer, this is a product-by-process limitation that is given little patentable weight in an article claim. Further, this limitation is met by Nielsen because, again, the configuration of Fig. 7 of Nielsen would not be possible were it not for the temporary adhesion of first and second surface adhesives to maintain the rolled configuration. That is the figure necessarily illustrates the adhesion permitted to occur in the absence of any sheet blocking the adhesive on the second surface from engaging the first

surface. The inner rim is necessarily rolled toward an outer rim of the wafer in Fig. 7 of Nielsen, wherein "outer rim" is given its broadest reasonable interpretation since "outer rim" is found nowhere in the original specification and is thus not sufficiently supported by the drawings either. These responses are considered herein to fully address similar arguments with regard to claims 50 and 51.

Specification

2. The specification is objected to as failing to provide proper antecedent basis for the claimed subject matter. See 37 CFR 1.75(d)(1) and MPEP § 608.01(o). Correction of the following is required: there is no antecedent basis for the "outer rim" limitation added to the independent claims 37 and 50.

Drawings

3. The drawings are objected to under 37 CFR 1.83(a). The drawings must show every feature of the invention specified in the claims. Therefore, the outer rim of the adhesive wafer must be shown or the feature(s) canceled from the claim(s). No new matter should be entered.

Corrected drawing sheets in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121(d) are required in reply to the Office action to avoid abandonment of the application. Any amended replacement drawing sheet should include all of the figures appearing on the immediate prior version of the sheet, even if only one figure is being amended. The figure or figure number of an amended drawing should not be labeled as "amended." If a drawing figure is to be canceled, the appropriate figure must be removed from the replacement sheet, and where necessary, the remaining figures must be renumbered and appropriate changes made to the brief description of the several views of the drawings for consistency. Additional replacement sheets may be necessary to show the

renumbering of the remaining figures. Each drawing sheet submitted after the filing date of an application must be labeled in the top margin as either "Replacement Sheet" or "New Sheet" pursuant to 37 CFR 1.121(d). If the changes are not accepted by the examiner, the applicant will be notified and informed of any required corrective action in the next Office action. The objection to the drawings will not be held in abeyance.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

4. The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

> The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

5. Claims 37, 39-47, 50 and 60 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. The claim(s) contains subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventor(s), at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention. There is no support in the disclosure as originally filed for an outer rim of the recited adhesive wafer. In the absence of any clear definition of "rim" in the specification, the examiner must rely upon the plain meaning. It is the examiner's position that while certain plain meanings of "rim" are synonymous with perimeter, some are not and refer to a raised edge. It is also the examiner's belief that the applicant intends "rim" and perimeter to refer to slightly different structural features, wherein "outer rim" is a feature not supported by the specification as originally filed. To overcome this rejection, the applicant must either state in a reply to this action that "rim" and "perimeter" are intended to be equivalent and thus both supported by the

disclosure, or, if they are not, amend claims 37 and 50 to refer instead to a perimeter or explain persuasively why they are different yet both supported.

6. Claims 40 and 41 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. The claim(s) contains subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventor(s), at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention. Claim 40 depends from claim 37 which recites a second surface of an adhesive wafer having a removable release liner, yet recites that the device further comprises a carrier sheet disposed on the second surface and extending from the outer rim to the hydrophobic layer. The disclosure as originally filed does not support a single embodiment wherein both a removable release liner and carrier sheet are present wherein the carrier sheet is disposed on the second surface. If both a carrier sheet and removable release liner are present, as has been explained in previous actions, the removable release liner is embodied as a separator sheet that is between the carrier sheet and the hydrophobic adhesive. Applicant's own claim 53 clearly states this. Thus claim 40 reciting a carrier sheet disposed on the same second surface having a removable release loner introduces new matter. Claim 41 depends from claim 40 and is thus also rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

7. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having

ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

8. This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

9. Claims 37, 39, 42-47 and 50-52 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Nielsen (WO 98/53771 A1).

With respect to **claim 37:** Nielsen discloses an ostomy appliance body side member 1 comprising an adhesive wafer in the form of a moldable mass of adhesive 7 extending between an outer rim/perimeter and an inner rim defining a hole for accommodating a stoma. The wafer 7 is a moldable mass of hydrophilic hydrocolloid adhesive and thus necessarily has a first moisture-absorbing adhesive surface for securing the appliance to a user's skin, as is the nature of a hydrophilic hydrocolloid adhesive. The wafer 5 has a second surface covered with a removable release liner 16 (Fig. 1, Page 6, lines 19-21) A portion of the adhesive wafer 7 surrounding the stoma, specifically the inner rim, has balanced plastic and elastic properties (Page 11, lines 20-24) A central part of the second surface of said wafer 7 surrounding said stoma-accommodating hole is provided with an adhesive layer in the form of a moldable backing thereon (Figs. 3,7, Page 8, lines 10-14) that is compatible with the first adhesive surface inasmuch as Nielsen discloses that it is sprayed on the adhesive wafer second surface and it allows the temporary adhesion of the first surface to the second surface 5 shown in Fig. 7.

With regard to the limitation "wherein the stoma-accommodating hole is enlarged by removing the removable release liner from the second surface of the adhesive wafer to expose the hydrophobic adhesive", such limitation constitutes product-by-process claim language that is given little patentable weight in an article claim. The release liner is necessarily removed prior to forming said torus, as formation of the torus requires access to the upper adhesive layer to temporarily hold the inner rim in its rolled position prior to formation, release and lock of the torus 20 against the stoma. Thus if the torus is formed, the release liner has already been removed. (Page 7, lines 1-9, Page 12, lines 3-6) The torus 20 is locked in said rolled up position by adhesion between the first hydrocolloid adhesive surface that has swelled upon absorption of moisture, and said adhesive upper surface of the moldable backing as provided on said second surface.

Nielsen discloses that the adhesive moldable backing defining the adhesive second surface is made of a material that is a polymer material that protects the second surface of the wafer 7 from stoma secretions. (Page 8, lines 10-13) Nielsen also discloses that the torus is held in its locked position by swelling of the hydrocolloid adhesive from the first surface against both the stoma and the second surface defined by the moldable backing that causes release from the second surface defined by said moldable backing. (Page 8, lines 8-10, Page 12, lines 3-9) It is examiner's position that if the moldable backing adhesive and the second surface defined thereon was hydrophilic, the humidity and secretions disclosed by Nielsen would cause the first surface hydrocolloid adhesive to stick excessively to the moldable backing, interfering with its release from the second surface and subsequent expansion to properly fit the stoma. Therefore, although Nielsen does not explicitly disclose that the moldable backing adhesive layer defining the second surface is a hydrophobic adhesive layer, it would be obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify the device of Nielsen such that the moldable backing adhesive

layer provided on the second surface of the wafer is a hydrophobic adhesive layer. This ensures that the moldable backing is in fact protecting the wafer from secretions, and is not absorbing moisture in such a manner as to interfere with the expansion of the first surface hydrocolloid adhesive to fit snugly around the stoma. The device fairly suggested by Nielsen thus renders the limitation "the torus being locked in said rolled up position by adhesion between the first adhesive surface and said adhesive upper surface of the hydrophobic adhesive layer as provided on said second surface" obvious.

With respect to **claim 39:** Adhesive wafer 7 disclosed by Nielsen is made from an adhesive including hydrocolloids. (Page 8, lines 8-10)

With respect to **claim 42:** A removable release liner 15 disclosed by Nielsen is disposed on the first adhesive surface. (Fig. 1, Page 6, lines 9, 10)

With respect to **claim 43:** The carrier sheet 16 disclosed by Nielsen extends to the central part of the wafer 7. (Fig. 1)

With respect to **claim 44:** The carrier sheet 16 on a central part of the second surface of the adhesive wafer 7 surrounding the stoma is provided with a weakening pattern in the form of a slit liner in the area defining handle 17. (Page 6, lines 23-25)

With respect to **claim 45:** The part of the adhesive wafer 7 surrounding the stoma is formed as an exchangeable sealing member associated with a receiving member 4 and is disposed in a hole of the wafer and having a hole for accommodating a stoma. (Page 7, lines 15-18)

With respect to **claim 46:** Body side member 1 further comprises a coupling component 18 for releasable attachment of a receiving bag 4. (Page 8, line 22)

With respect to **claim 47:** The coupling component disclosed by Nielsen includes matching coupling rings 18. (Page 8, line 22)

With respect to **claim 50:** Nielsen teaches a method of applying an ostomy appliance body side member having an adhesive wafer 2 with an inner rim that defines a hole 3 for accommodating a stoma, a first adhesive surface for securing the appliance to a user's skin and a second surface, a portion of the adhesive wafer surrounding the stoma having balanced plastic and elastic properties. A central part of the second surface has an adhesive in the form of a moldable backing/adhesive layer that is compatible with the first adhesive surface of the adhesive wafer inasmuch as Nielsen discloses that it is sprayed on the adhesive wafer second surface and it allows the temporary adhesion of the first surface to the second surface shown in Fig. 7. The central part also has a removable release liner 16 disposed over the adhesive layer. The method disclosed by Nielsen comprises the following steps: removing the release liner from the second surface adhesive layer inasmuch as formation of the torus requires access to the second surface adhesive to temporarily hold the inner rim in its rolled position prior to formation, release and lock of the torus 20 against the stoma (Page 7, lines 1-9, Page 12, lines 3-6); enlarging the hole to a size of the stoma by rolling the inner rim of the hole of the sealing member toward the outer perimeter of the wafer, forming a torus 20 (Page 12, lines 3-13); adhering the second-surface adhesive layer of member 7 to the first adhesive surface (Page 12, lines 14-17); and aligning the stoma and the stoma-accommodating hole of the ostomy

appliance body side member 1 (Page 12, lines 10-13) and placing the body side member on the abdomen of the ostomate with the stoma projecting into the hole, creating a snug fit between the appliance and the ostomy. (Page 12, lines 10-13)

Nielsen discloses that the adhesive moldable backing defining the adhesive second surface is made of a material that is a polymer material that protects the second surface of the wafer 7 from stoma secretions. (Page 8, lines 10-13) Nielsen also discloses that the torus is held in its locked position by swelling of the hydrocolloid adhesive from the first surface against both the stoma and the second surface defined by the moldable backing that causes release from the second surface defined by said moldable backing. (Page 8, lines 8-10, Page 12, lines 3-9) It is examiner's position that if the moldable backing adhesive and the second surface defined thereon was hydrophilic, the humidity and secretions disclosed by Nielsen would cause the first surface hydrocolloid adhesive to stick excessively to the moldable backing, interfering with its release from the second surface and subsequent expansion to properly fit the stoma. Therefore, although Nielsen does not explicitly disclose that the moldable backing adhesive layer defining the second surface is a hydrophobic adhesive layer, it would be obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify the device of Nielsen such that the moldable backing adhesive layer provided on the second surface of the wafer is a hydrophobic adhesive layer. This ensures that the moldable backing is in fact protecting the wafer from secretions, and is not absorbing moisture in such a manner as to interfere with the expansion of the first surface hydrocolloid adhesive to fit snugly around the stoma. The method fairly suggested by Nielsen thus renders the limitations “a central part of the second surface surrounding said stoma-accommodating hole being provided with a hydrophobic adhesive compatible with the first adhesive surface of the adhesive wafer”, “a removable release liner disposed over the hydrophobic adhesive layer”, “removing the release liner from the hydrophobic adhesive layer” and “adhering the hydrophobic

adhesive layer to the first adhesive surface" unpatentable.

.

With respect to **claim 51:** Nielsen teaches a method of applying a separately exchangeable ostomy sealing member 2 in a body side member 1, said sealing member having balanced plastic and elastic properties and including an inner rim that defines a first hole 3 for accommodating a stoma, a first adhesive surface adapted for securing the sealing member to a user's skin and for receiving secretions from the stoma, and a second surface facing away from the user. A central part of the second surface surrounding said stoma-accommodating hole is provided with an adhesive in the form of a moldable backing/adhesive layer that is compatible with the first adhesive surface of the adhesive wafer inasmuch as Nielsen discloses that it is sprayed on the adhesive wafer second surface and it allows the temporary adhesion of the first surface to the second surface shown in Fig. 7. The method disclosed by Nielsen comprises the following steps: a) locating the stoma and aligning the stoma and the hole of the body side member and placing the body side member on the abdomen of the ostomate with the stoma projecting into the hole (Page 11, line 25 – Page 12, line 3), b) removing the release liner from the second surface adhesive layer inasmuch as formation of the torus requires access to the second surface adhesive to temporarily hold the inner rim in its rolled position prior to formation, release and lock of the torus 20 against the stoma (Page 7, lines 1-9, Page 12, lines 3-6); c) enlarging the first hole of the sealing member by rolling the inner rim of the hole of the sealing member toward an outer perimeter of the sealing member, forming a torus 20 (Page 12, lines 3-6), d) adapting the hole to the size of the stoma (Page 12, lines 10-13), e) adhering the first adhesive surface to the second surface adhesive layer of the sealing member (Page 12, lines 14-17), f) aligning the stoma and the second hole of the ostomy sealing member (Page 12, lines 10-13) and g) placing the sealing member 7 in the second hole of the body side member on the

abdomen of the ostomate with the stoma projecting into the first hole 3, creating a snug fit between the appliance and the ostomy. (Fig. 1, Page 12, lines 10-13)

Nielsen discloses that the adhesive moldable backing defining the adhesive second surface is made of a material that is a polymer material that protects the second surface of the wafer 7 from stoma secretions. (Page 8, lines 10-13) Nielsen also discloses that the torus is held in its locked position by swelling of the hydrocolloid adhesive from the first surface against both the stoma and the second surface defined by the moldable backing that causes release from the second surface defined by said moldable backing. (Page 8, lines 8-10, Page 12, lines 3-9) It is examiner's position that if the moldable backing adhesive and the second surface defined thereon was hydrophilic, the humidity and secretions disclosed by Nielsen would cause the first surface hydrocolloid adhesive to stick excessively to the moldable backing, interfering with its release from the second surface and subsequent expansion to properly fit the stoma. Therefore, although Nielsen does not explicitly disclose that the moldable backing adhesive layer defining the second surface is a hydrophobic adhesive layer, it would be obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify the device of Nielsen such that the moldable backing adhesive layer provided on the second surface of the wafer is a hydrophobic adhesive layer. This ensures that the moldable backing is in fact protecting the wafer from secretions, and is not absorbing moisture in such a manner as to interfere with the expansion of the first surface hydrocolloid adhesive to fit snugly around the stoma. The method fairly suggested by Nielsen thus renders the limitations "a central part of the second surface surrounding the first hole being provided with a hydrophobic adhesive compatible with the first adhesive surface of the adhesive wafer", "removing the release liner from the adhesive upper surface of the hydrophobic adhesive layer" and "adhering the hydrophobic adhesive layer to the first adhesive surface" unpatentable.

Allowable Subject Matter

10. Claims 53-55 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

11. Claim 60 is allowed.

Reasons for Indicating Allowable Subject Matter

12. The following is a statement of reasons for the indication of allowable subject matter: with respect to claim 53, there is no motivation to first modify the device of Nielsen (WO 98/53771 A1), the closest prior art of record, such that the wafer explicitly contains a hydrophobic adhesive layer and then further modify the resulting device so as to have a release liner protecting the hydrophobic adhesive layer that is embodied as a separator sheet covered by a carrier sheet having a weakening zone defining a central part of the carrier sheet. Nielsen only fairly suggests a hydrophobic adhesive layer and, while Nielsen discloses protecting all of the adhesive surfaces with release liners, a known practice to one of ordinary skill in the art, it would not be obvious to further modify the device by specifically protecting the hydrophobic adhesive layer with a two-layer release liner having a weakening zone. Claims 54 and 55 depend directly or ultimately from claim 53 and thus also recite allowable subject matter.

Reasons for Allowance

13. The following is an examiner's statement of reasons for allowance: there is no motivation to first modify the device of Nielsen (WO 98/53771 A1), the closest prior art of record, such that the wafer explicitly contains a hydrophobic adhesive layer and then further modify the resulting

device so as to have a release liner protecting the hydrophobic adhesive layer covered by a carrier sheet removable to expose a portion of the hydrophobic adhesive layer. Nielsen only fairly suggests a hydrophobic adhesive layer and, while Nielsen discloses protecting all of the adhesive surfaces with release liners, a known practice to one of ordinary skill in the art, Nielsen does not disclose or suggest a release liner and a separate carrier sheet disposed over at least a portion of the liner that is removable to expose a portion of the hydrophobic adhesive layer.

Any comments considered necessary by applicant must be submitted no later than the payment of the issue fee and, to avoid processing delays, should preferably accompany the issue fee. Such submissions should be clearly labeled "Comments on Statement of Reasons for Allowance."

Conclusion

14. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to MELANIE J. HAND whose telephone number is (571)272-6464. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon-Thurs 8:00-5:30, alternate Fridays 8:00-4:30.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Tatyana Zalukaeva can be reached on 571-272-1115. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Melanie J Hand/
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 3761